

**REMARKS**

After entry of the above amendments, claims 1-8 will remain pending in the above identified application. No new matter has been added. Filed concurrently herewith under separate cover, is a Request for Continued Examination under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114.

**Claims 3-6: Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Claims 3-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,073,165 to Narasimhan et al.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Brothers v Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

While Applicant believes claims 3-6 are distinguishable over the cited prior art, in order to advance prosecution, Applicant has amended claims 3-6. The amendments to claims 3-4 do not add new matter and are supported by the specification at page 6. The amendments to claims 5-6 also do not add new matter and are supported by the specification at page 16. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are now allowable over the cited art, thus, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

**Claims 1-2, 7-8: Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-2 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,510,455, in view of Paarsmarkt et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,118,856, and Narasimhan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,073,165.

Claims 7-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narasimhan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,073,165, in view of Moon et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,138,146.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. See MPEP §§ 706.02(j), 2143-2143.03; *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488 (Fed. Cir. 1991). First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge

generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. *Id.* Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. *Id.* Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *Id.* The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *Id.*


While Applicant believes claims 1-2 and 7-8 are not obvious in light of the cited prior art, in order to advance prosecution, Applicant has amended claims 1-2 and 7-8. These amendments do not add new matter and are supported by the specification at page 6. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are now allowable over the cited art, thus, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

On the basis of the above remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is believed to be warranted and such action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 14, 2005

  
Ramela S. Merkadeau  
Registration No. 53,318

MANATT, PHELPS & PHILLIPS LLP  
1001 Page Mill Road, Building 2  
Palo Alto, California 94304  
650-812-1375 Telephone  
650-213-0286 Facsimile